

# California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision Project

## Potential BRCC/SAG Science Recommendations

January 17, 2012

On January 10, 2012 and again on January 17 the California Fish and Wildlife Strategic Vision (CFWSV) Blue Ribbon Citizen Commission (BRCC) and Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) met for science discussion topic meetings. Individual BRCC and SAG members, as well as participating California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC) employees, volunteered to develop text for potential recommendations to be considered by the BRCC/SAG. This document highlights the potential recommendations developed through the work of those volunteers over the last week and during discussion on January 17, 2012.

***Potential Science Recommendation #1: Credibility: Decisions made by managers and policy-makers are informed by credible\* science.***

Implementation recommendations include:

- A. Managers and policy-makers use science that employs the standard protocols of the profession (peer review, publication, science review panel, etc.).
- B. Decision-making incorporates adaptive management to the extent possible (i.e., outcomes are tracked and new knowledge permits course corrections).
- C. Where the body of legitimate science informing the topic is in disagreement, those uncertainties or differences of opinion are identified. Likewise, where the body of science is incomplete to support a necessary decision, standard and transparent means, such as 'expert judgment' are used to advance management.
- D. Scientific professionals in DFG are held to and protected by a DFG Science Quality Assurance and Integrity Policy

Ties to Strategic Vision

- Goal 1: Strong Relationships with Other Agencies, Organizations and the Public: Objective 6: Share data, processes, tools, knowledge, expertise and information
- Goal 2: Highly Valued Programs and Quality Services Objective 7: Engage in broadly-informed and transparent decision-making (multiple sciences, public attitudes, traditional knowledge, etc.)

*\* "Credible" is used here to also represent "best-available science" also known as "best scientific information available" (BSIA), which according to the National Research Council should not be overly prescriptive due to the dynamic nature of science, but should include the evaluation principles of relevance, inclusiveness, objectivity, transparency, timeliness, verification, validation, and peer review of information as appropriate.*

**Potential Science Recommendation #2: Capacity: DFG has capacity to provide\* credible science for management and policy-makers.**

Implementation recommendations include:

- A. Request a cost-benefit analysis of what is involved in internal versus external development of science as well as barriers to improvement/making changes and include an identification of gaps and needs in scientific capacity, such as integrated resource management.
- B. DFG has in-house experts who are skilled at supporting, developing and cultivating scientific partnerships.
- C. DFG has in-house scientists who are skilled at interpreting science and data to be effectively utilized by DFG.
- D. Scientific professionals in DFG are held to and protected by a DFG Science Quality Assurance and Integrity Policy
- E. Increase the use of existing and available science, such as access to JSTOR

Ties to Strategic Vision

- Goal 2: Highly Valued Programs and Quality Services, Objective 7: Engage in broadly-informed and transparent decision-making (multiple sciences, public attitudes, traditional knowledge, etc.)

*\* "Provide" here is not meant to imply that DFG has only the internal capacity to provide science for management and policy-makers. Rather that DFG determines the best way to provide scientific information in a variety of ways – some of which would be internally developed, some through the use of scientific information gathered through external means, and/or a combination of both.*